

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,990	03/26/2004	James Jolly Clark	5853-00502	8493
35690	7590 01/13/2006		EXAMINER	
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.			HWU, DAVIS D	
	P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398		4 P.T. I. P. IV	D. 1000 \
AUSTIN, T.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
			DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

J.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Office Ac	tion Summary Pa	rt of Paper No./Mail Date 20060109			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/7/04, 6/4/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents application from the Internation for a list of the priority documents application from the Interna	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the order and th	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Application Papers	ciccion requirement.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	coloction requirement				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.	on from consideration.				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.					
Disposition of Claims					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
, 	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 March 2004</u> . 2a)⊡ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
Status 1) M. Responsive to communication (c) filed on 26 M.	orob 2004				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim 16(a) and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
	Davis D. Hwu	3752			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	10/809,990	CLARK ET AL.			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			

Application/Control Number: 10/809,990 Page 2

Art Unit: 3752

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3 and 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brock.

Brock discloses a water irrigation system comprising a computer system, a sensing unit comprising a moisture gauge wherein the gauge comprises a collector configured to receive moisture, a flex circuit coupled to the collector wherein the flex circuit comprises a capacitor 94 wherein the capacitor is part of a resonant circuit (Column 5), wherein the collector and the flex circuit are configured such that a change in an amount of moisture in the collector alters a frequency of the resonant circuit, wherein the sensing unit is configured to assess an amount of moisture in the collector and provide output that is a function of the amount of moisture in the collector to the computer system (Column 5), wherein the computer system is configured to control irrigation of a zone to be irrigated at least partially based on the assessed amount of moisture in the collector. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the device of Brock comprises a collector to receive moisture since current moisture conditions are compared to requirement parameters for irrigation. The placement of the sensing unit from the computer system as recited in claim 2 would have been a matter of design

Art Unit: 3752

preference. The device of Brock is capable of carrying out the methods of claims 18-23 since it comprises all of the structural limitations of the instant invention.

3. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brock in view of Dodds et al.

Dodds et al. teaches a water irrigation system using solar cells to generate power for the system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made of have modified the device of Brock by using a solar panel as taught by Dodds et al. to produce electricity.

4. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brock in view of Wood et al.

Wood et al. teaches using in an irrigation system a computer system comprising an infrared receiver and an infrared transceiver to monitor foliage conditions to determine moisture requirements. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Brock by incorporating an infrared receiver and an infrared transceiver as taught by Wood et al. to monitor moisture requirements of crops to be irrigated.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davis D. Hwu whose telephone number is 571-272-4904. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Scherbel can be reached on 571-272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this

Application/Control Number: 10/809,990 Page 4

Art Unit: 3752

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Davis Hwu

DAVIS HWU PRIMARY EXAMINER